

The Author as Translator  
The Struggle with Language and Authority  
in Pietro del Monte's *De dignoscendis hominibus* (Milan, 1492)  
and *Exercitiorum collectanea* (Milan, 1509)\*

TOON VAN HOUDT – INGRID SPERBER

Introduction

Having fallen into almost complete oblivion today, Pietro del Monte or Petrus Montius (1457–1509) won renown as an outstanding *condottiere* and a man of vast learning during his lifetime. He featured in Castiglione's famous 'Il corteggiano' and was well acquainted with Leonardo da Vinci who praised him as a bizarre genius combining the qualities of a soldier, an engineer, and a theologian. Tuscan by birth, Monte stemmed from a noble family bearing the title of marquis of Monte Santa Maria. For many years, he was active as a soldier in Spain until, in 1492, he returned to his native country where he served as a soldier and master of arms in Florence, Venice, and Milan.<sup>1</sup> Shortly after

---

\* Revised and extended version of a paper presented at The Cardiff Conference on the Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages, Leuven, 8–12 July 2013, entitled 'Translation and Authority – Authorities in Translation'.

<sup>1</sup> See the excellent biographical overview composed by Marie-Madeleine Fontaine on the basis of admittedly rather scanty source material, *Le condottiere Pietro del Monte, philosophe et écrivain de la Renaissance (1457–1509)*, Centre d'Etudes Franco-Italiennes, Universités de Turin et de Savoie. Textes et études – Domaine italien, 6 (Genève – Paris, 1991). For the family background of Monte, see also Marie-Madeleine Fontaine, *Der Condottiere Pietro del Monte (1457–1509). Die gymnastica bellica zwischen Philosophie und Literatur*, in Arnd Krüger – Bernd Wedemeyer (eds.), *Aus Biographien Sportgeschichte lernen. Festschrift zum 90. Geburtstag von Prof. Dr. Wilhelm Henze* (Hoya, 2000), pp. 79–86 (esp. pp. 80–81). Monte is wrongly called Milanese by Francesco Erspamer in *La biblioteca di don Ferrante. Duello e onore nella cultura del Cinquecento*, Centro Studi 'Europa delle Corti' – Biblioteca del Cinquecento, 18 (Roma, 1982), p. 83. According to Sydney Anglo, 'Monte was a late fifteenth-century Spanish master of arms whose career was mainly pursued in Italy', *The Martial Arts of Renaissance Europe* (New Haven, 2000), p. 1 and *passim*. He already expressed the same view in his article 'The Man Who Taught Leonardo Darts. Pietro Monte and His 'Lost' Fencing Book', *The Antiquaries Journal*, 69 (1989), 261–278. On the implications of this view, see Fontaine's review in *Bulletin Monumental*, 161.3 (2003), 279–280, as well as her article 'Comment Pietro del Monte, condottiere italien, parlait espagnol', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 54 (1992), 163–173. For a nuanced discussion of Monte's origin, see Jeffrey L. Forgeng, 'Pietro Monte's *Exercises* and the Medieval Science of Arms', in Donald LaRocca (ed.), *The Armorer's Art: Essays in Honor of Stuart Pyhrr* (New York, forthcoming), n. 3. Monte's presence in Baldassar Castiglione's famous 'Il cortegiano' is discussed in detail in Fontaine's article 'Pietro del Monte et Baldassar Castiglione. Capitaines et courtisans', in Paolo Carile a.o. (eds.), *Par-*

his untimely death on 14 May 1509 on the battlefield of Agnadel, his voluminous *Exercitiorum atque artis militaris collectanea* were published rather hastily in Milan in July 1509, probably with the help of Galeazzo da Sanseverino, son-in-law of Duke Luigi Sforza and Monte's former pupil in physical training and vaulting, to whom the work is dedicated. In all likelihood, the Milanese publisher, Giovan Angelo Scinzenzeler, wanted to exploit the fame of the deceased Monte, heightened by his heroic courage and bravery during the Venetian campaigns of 1508–09, in order to ensure the commercial success of the publication.<sup>2</sup> However, Scinzenzeler partly failed to reach his goal: the *Collectanea*, the very first important combat manual ever to be printed, were never reprinted nor even published in a vernacular version.<sup>3</sup>

The work is as multifarious as the author himself. It offers first and foremost a systematic and quite exhaustive account of all the physical exercises and battle techniques which a soldier had to master in order to be successful in combat and, consequently, to achieve name and fame as a 'condottiere'. The painstakingly detailed description of those exercises is largely based on the author's personal experience as a soldier and a trainer of soldiers, most notably of Sanseverino himself.<sup>4</sup> Although Monte had written on this subject before, it is quite clear that he now aimed to write a definitive book, which distinguished itself from his former work – and that of others – by its comprehensive nature. As he states in his letter of dedication, he set himself the task of writing down all those exercises and techniques which he had practiced to make sure that this vast body of experience would not be lost for future generations.<sup>5</sup> Throughout the work, Monte presents himself as a magister, and emphasizes both the scientific and practical nature of his work. On the one hand, he says, his work can be defined as a science belonging to mathe-

---

cours et rencontres. Mélanges de langue, d'histoire et de littérature française offerts à Enea Balmas (Paris, 1993), pp. 281–298.

<sup>2</sup> On Scinzenzeler and the hurry with which he published the *Collectanea*, see Fontaine, *Le condottiere Pietro del Monte* (as in n. 1), p. 49.

<sup>3</sup> With the possible exception of a Spanish paraphrase of some chapters of the *Collectanea*, entitled 'Ejercicios de las Armas' ('Exercises of weapons'), which is preserved in manuscript form in the Real Biblioteca de Madrid (Escorial MS A.IV.23, ff. 1–52<sup>v</sup>). Cf. Anglo, *The Martial Arts* (as in n. 1), p. 215. According to Forgeng, Pietro Monte's *Exercises* (as in n. 1), p. 4, it is to be considered rather as a late, very fragmentary and corrupt copy of the Spanish original on which the Latin text of (some parts of) the *Collectanea* was based.

<sup>4</sup> *Collectanea*, Prologus, f. 9: ... *ut memoriter complecti possit aliqua rerum sive exercitiorum pars inter nos aliquando operata*. We quote from the (unidentified) copy made available on [www.fioredeliberi.org/topics/sources](http://www.fioredeliberi.org/topics/sources). The punctuation and spelling have been moderately modified.

<sup>5</sup> *Collectanea*, Prologus, f. 9: *Si vero scientiam de hoc habuerimus, decet scriptis annotare, ut in posterum nequaquam deperdatur*.

matics, in so far as it deals with *figurae* – the more or less geometrical forms which the body and its members have to adopt in order to properly execute a particular exercise.<sup>6</sup> On the other hand, Monte teaches a practical art that is to be subsumed under the so-called *artes mechanicae seu manuales*.<sup>7</sup> As such, he is perfectly aware of the inevitable limitations of his work. As he readily confesses, the detailed description of physical exercises does not suffice to understand them: speech must be accompanied by the actual demonstration of an experienced master. And even if they are understood, this does not suffice to make proficient soldiers, as comprehension needs to be complemented with practice, with systematic training under the guidance of an experienced coach like Monte himself.<sup>8</sup>

However, the *Collectanea* are much more than a comprehensive account of fighting techniques. As Monte is of the opinion that success on the battlefield depends to a large extent on profound self-knowledge and equally profound knowledge of the adversary, the lengthy description of exercises is complemented with fairly long sections on the nature of individuals. Taking climate and humoral theory as the starting-points for his rather peculiar physiognomic observations, Monte endeavours to give detailed descriptions of both the outer appearance and physical as well as mental qualities of various categories of people and, perhaps somewhat surprisingly, also of animals, in particular of horses, as well as of the manufactured products derived from them (such as leather). Far from being a mere digression meant to display Monte's vast erudition, the medical-physiognomic section is an integral part of the *Collectanea*, in that it forms the basis of a description of specific exercises tailored to the needs of sanguine, choleric, melancholic, and phlegmatic persons and horses.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> *Collectanea*, lib. 1, cap. 2, f. 12: *Et sic, quamvis dicatur mathematica, eo quod sub figuris cadit ...* In the course of the sixteenth century, the bodily movements entailed in (noble) martial exercise were more systematically subjected to complex geometrical patterns. Cf. Georges Vigarello, *S'exercer, jouer*, in id. (ed.), *Histoire du corps*, vol. 1. De la Renaissance aux Lumières (Paris, 2005), pp. 235–302 (esp. p. 249). This was especially the case with Italian swordplay; cf. Gary Chelak, *Italian Circle Theory. A Study of the Applied Geometry of the Italian Renaissance*, [www.Tattershall.discoperta.com](http://www.Tattershall.discoperta.com) (internet publication 2005). See also Anglo, *The Martial Arts* (as in n. 1), pp. 138–140.

<sup>7</sup> On the term and its meaning, see e.g. Elspeth Whitney, *Artes mechanicae*, in F.A.C. Mantello – A.G. Rigg (eds.), *Medieval Latin. An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide* (Washington, 1996), pp. 431–435.

<sup>8</sup> *Collectanea*, lib. 1, cap. 2: *Quamobrem advertendum sit quod non possumus per sola verba artes mechanicas seu manuales prorsus adiscere*. Cf. Anglo, *The Man Who Taught Leonardo Darts* (as in n. 1), p. 267 and id., *The Martial Arts* (as in n. 1), pp. 1–2.

<sup>9</sup> The medical-physiognomic and the geographical-physiognomic sections comprise the concluding chapters 34–109 of book 1. Monte explains the practical value of a thorough

However interesting the contents of the *Collectanea* may be for both historians of the martial arts and specialists of late medieval and early modern medicine and science,<sup>10</sup> our main focus will be on the linguistic aspects of the voluminous work, as well as on Monte's mixed roles as author and translator. This mixture of roles has everything to do with the truly multi-linguistic dimension of the treatise – a feature duly recognized and partially analyzed by Sydney Anglo and Marie-Madeleine Fontaine in their pioneering studies on Monte. Partly based on *De dignoscendis hominibus*, an earlier work written by Monte in rather poor Spanish but translated into Latin by a young soldier-scholar aspiring to write as an accomplished humanist, Monte eventually decided to choose Latin as a medium to introduce both soldiers and men of letters into the martial arts. At first sight, then, the *Collectanea* – or at least a substantial part of it – can be considered a Latin adaptation of a Latin translation from the Spanish. The lexical level of the text proves to be even more fascinating, as it clearly betrays the translational difficulties and doubts faced by the author who tried very hard to divulge novel and rapidly changing martial techniques in Latin rather than the vernacular. As we shall see, Monte's choice of Latin as his primary tool of communication in the *Collectanea* created linguistic tensions and shifts between Spanish, Italian, and Latin: the work reveals the struggle which the author / translator was forced to fight in order to describe a new world in an ancient language; to be honest, it is a struggle he sometimes lost.

The author as translator: the macro-level of the text

The full title of the *Collectanea* reads as follows: *Petri Montii exercitiorum: atque artis militaris collectanea In tris (sic) libros distincta* (‘Collected works on exercises and military art, divided into three books, by Petrus Montius’). No reference is made to any translator, so we can rest assured that the treatise was written in Latin by Monte himself. As the author explicitly indicates in the prologue to his work, it is partly based on his previous work *De dignoscendis hominibus* (‘How to recognize people’) which was issued on 17 December 1492 by the Milanese

---

knowledge of humoral temperaments in lib. 1, cap. 32, entitled *Quanta utilitas sit complexiones cognoscere et detrimentum ipsas ignorare*.

<sup>10</sup> Monte has been given due attention by Sydney Anglo in his article ‘The Man Who Taught Leonardo Darts’ (as in n. 1) and his standard work *The Martial Arts of Renaissance Europe* (as in n. 1). As a result of his research, the *Collectanea* are briefly mentioned in E. Malcolm Parkinson, *Weapons and Warfare*, in Mantello – Rigg, *Medieval Latin* (as in n. 7), pp. 447–451 (p. 447). However, Monte's works on martial exercises, including fencing, are conspicuously absent from Henry William Pardoel, *The Complete Bibliography of the Art and Sport of Fencing*, Commemorative Edition, 18/1000 (Kingston, Ont., 1996). Furthermore, Monte is completely overlooked by Martin Porter in his encompassing work *Windows of the Soul. The Art of Physiognomy in European Culture, 1470–1780*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford, 2005).

printer Antonio Zarotto.<sup>11</sup> It was written in rather fluent Latin by the young Spanish scholar and soldier Gonzalo de Ayora from Cordoba (1466–1538)<sup>12</sup> on the basis of the Spanish original produced by Monte himself. Ayora had met the author during his extended stay in Milan, and was closely collaborating with him in order to render his unadorned and rather awkward manuscript (Monte was not a native Spanish speaker) into a Latin text that would not offend humanist sensitivities.<sup>13</sup> As Monte readily acknowledges, he was unable to execute the translation himself, as he had just taken the first steps towards mastering the Latin language.<sup>14</sup>

The title of the work is slightly misleading in that it fails to capture the impressively broad array of topics discussed by Monte, who does not present himself as a mere *magister* (a master, a training coach), but rather proudly defines himself as a (self-consciously independent-minded) philosopher (*philosophus*).<sup>15</sup> Dedicated to the Spanish crown prince Juan, son of queen Isabella the Catholic, the work can be read as a mirror-for-princes aimed at inculcating all the theoretical and practical knowledge needed to develop the prince's mind and body. It offers for instance practical advice about the lifestyle a prince should adopt (moderation in eating, drinking, and sleeping is strongly recommended) and the books he should read or rather avoid reading, and graphically depicts the many vices of the contemporary world. But it also discusses such thorny theological issues as the problem of free will and the immaculate conception of the virgin Mary. Dealing at length with astronomy and astrology, the author tackles the hotly debated question of whether or not the moon, the sun and the stars have an indelible impact on the nature of human (and other) beings. Most attention, however, is paid to medicine and geogra-

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Fontaine, *Le condottiere Pietro del Monte* (as in n. 1), p. 46.

<sup>12</sup> In one of his prefaces to queen Isabel of Spain, Ayora apologetically states that he was only 26 years old when he undertook the arduous task of translating Monte's manuscript into Latin (*De dignoscendis*, lib. 5, *Proboemium*, f. 171). On Ayora and his relationship to Monte, see further Fontaine, *Le condottiere Pietro del Monte* (as in n. 1), pp. 16–18 and Sydney Anglo, *The Man Who Taught Leonardo Darts* (as in n. 1), pp. 262 and 265.

<sup>13</sup> *De dignoscendis*, *Prologus Ayorae*, f. 8<sup>r</sup>: ... *verum quia in ea ipsa ab auctore haud parum eruditus sim, eius mentem planius caeteris explanare posse existimavi*. We quote from the copy preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (shelf number Res-R-214), electronically available through Gallica, Bibliothèque numérique (Numm-58276).

<sup>14</sup> *De dignoscendis*, *Prologus Montis*, f. 11<sup>r</sup>: *Eodem enim in tempore haec nobis duo contingunt – quae an disparia sint, tu ipse diiudica – , librum scilicet hunc componere et in litterarum elementis agnitione initium facere*.

<sup>15</sup> 'Self-consciously independent-minded', in so far as he frankly proclaims deliberately to ignore the vast body of learned books on the subjects he is treating and proudly professes solely to rely on his personal experience. Cf. e.g. *De dignoscendis*, *Argumentum*, f. 9<sup>r</sup>: ... *in qua nullam auctoritatem expostulat (sc. Montius) praeter quam experientia ipsa exhibebit*.

phy as crucial factors in determining the complexion (*complexio*) – the unique humoral balance – of men and horses alike.<sup>16</sup> As is the case with the *Collectanea*, humoral and climate theory form the basis of a penetrating analysis of various categories of individuals – an analysis that is carried much further in book 4 of *De dignoscendis hominibus* than in the *Collectanea*, as can easily be inferred from the fact that the author gives a more detailed description of the inner and outer qualities of the four basic temperaments (sanguine, choleric, melancholic, and phlegmatic), but also from the fact that he discerns and discusses various kinds of mixed complexions which are not treated as such in the *Collectanea*.<sup>17</sup> In both works, however, Monte systematically applies his medical-physiognomic insights to the training camp and the battlefield, minutely assessing the physical and mental advantages and disadvantages of each *complexio* and recommending specific exercises or fighting techniques for it. In that sense, the medical-physiognomic part paves the way for the extensive discussion of physical exercises and fighting techniques in book 5 – a subject matter taken up again in the *Collectanea*. Tellingly, the philosopher Monte feels compelled to apologize for his lengthy treatment of the martial arts – more explicitly and forcefully than Monte the training coach is inclined to do in his *Collectanea*. Considerably toning down the importance of these exercises, the author assures his readers, in general, and prince Juan, more particularly, that they have no merit in themselves, but only deserve attention in so far as they help us avoid sins and escape the passions or desires (*voluptates*) from which they stem.<sup>18</sup>

Despite the obvious overlap between *De dignoscendis hominibus* and *Collectanea*, a careful comparison of the two works clearly reveals that Monte did not simply copy passages from Ayora's translation to incorporate them into his new work. For one thing, the author explicitly states that he will only touch briefly

---

<sup>16</sup> On the meaning and purport of this crucial medical concept, see esp. D. Jacquart, *De crasis à complexio*. Notes sur le vocabulaire du tempérament en latin médiéval, in G. Sabbah (ed.), *Textes médicaux latins antiques*, Université de Saint-Etienne. Centre Jean Palermé. Mémoires, 5 (Saint-Etienne, 1984), pp. 71–76.

<sup>17</sup> In book 3, Monte distinguishes *sanguinei colerici*, *sanguinei colerici et idem melancholici*, *sanguinei colerici atque flegmatici*, *sanguinei melancholici*, *sanguinei melancholici colerici*, and *sanguinei melancholici flegmatici*.

<sup>18</sup> *De dignoscendis*, lib. 5, *Proboemium Montis*, f. 171<sup>v</sup>: *Non nos quidem iaculari, luctari, vel iustam pugnam exercere in se meritorium esse asserimus, verum haec atque huiusmodi satis sufficientiae possident, si dum in rebus ipsis praestemus peccata quae animum obnubilant et corpus absumunt, vitamus et voluptates, e quibus ea nascuntur, effugimus*. Cf. the more positive approach to physical exercise in *Collectanea*, lib. 1, cap. 33, f. 20: *Exercitia membrorum bona sunt, tamen non optima ad exercitia intellectus comparata, se quia bona saltem in positivo gradu dum iuvenes sumus exercitijs membrorum uti possumus (...). Dum iuvenes estis, etiam exercitia membrorum quandoque agite, sed tanquam perfecta, labores intellectus tanquam fundamentum tenete*.

on those subject matters which have already been treated at length in *De dignoscendis*,<sup>19</sup> and this indeed appears to be the case in both the sections on physiognomics and the chapters devoted to martial exercises. Moreover, Monte's recuperation of older material entails so drastic a change in language and style that one gets the impression that the author adopted some kind of 'intra-lingual' translation. The syntactically fairly classical, stylistically rather fluent Latin used by Ayora has been systematically turned into an extremely terse and arid prose text which is replete with post-classical syntactic constructions and turns of phrases. Two examples may suffice to illustrate the gap that separates Ayora's fairly humanist text from Monte's peculiar, from a strictly humanist point of view rather clumsy, Latin. Our first example is taken from the description of people with a sanguine complexion. Ayora's version runs as follows:

*Capita grandia pro reliquorum artuum discrimine et rotunda forma constructa tenent. Eorum facies inter mediocres et grossas consistit, quamvis carne abundet. Collum mediocrem tum longitudinem tum grossedinem possidet, quamquam breve, grossum et visui delectabile videatur, quam rem per omnem sui corporis partem sortiuntur: in se etenim gracilitatis apparentiam sine rigore et lassitudine ostendunt. Humeros versus brachia porrigunt, cubiti autem et coxae grossitudine excellunt. Crura vero et brachia ab inflexione seorsum gracilia habent, si eas partes omnes abinvicem comparaveris et inferiora ad superiorem grossedinem referas. Eorundem manus curtae ac lenes sunt, quarum digitorum capita spissa, dura et latitudinis expertia sunt. At partes quae birum undique circunt (quas pulpeculas haud immerito appellamus) carne grossiusculae sunt; caeterum molles manus possident. Aliqualem corpulentiusculam circa polices habent, iique magnitudine praestant. Palmas omni asperitate vacantes sortiri cernuntur, immo et quanto mortales maiorem huiusce sanguineae complexionis portionem occupant, ab ea parte qua pollex oritur maior grossitudo possidetur, et digitorum summitates graciliores redduntur. (...) Sanguinei linguae solutione ad verba exprimenda secundaque caeteris praestant. Eorum autem locutionis sonus, altitudo et grossitudo inter mediam atque subtilem est. Vocis organum ad pangendum suave illis natura denegata est. Caprino namque gutture (nomen a capris deductum) cantare asuescunt.*

(*De dignoscendis hominibus*, lib. 3, cap. 2, f. 75r–75v)

They have heads which are large, unlike the other limbs, and built in a round shape. Their face is between medium-sized and thick, though abounding in flesh. The neck is medium-sized, both in length and thickness, though it appears short, thick, and pleasant to the sight, and this applies throughout their whole body: they display in themselves, without

<sup>19</sup> *Collectanea*, lib. 1, *Prologus de complexionibus*, f. 21.

stiffness and heaviness, an appearance of slenderness. Their shoulders are stretched out towards the arms, while the elbows and hips excel in thickness. They have, on the other hand, legs and arms which are slender, starting from the place where they bend, if one compares all the parts separately and then relates the lower parts to the thickness above. The hands of those persons are short and soft, their fingertips are compact, hard, and lack wideness. But the parts which on all sides surround the hollow of the hand (and which we, not undeservedly, call *pulpeculae*) are somewhat thick from flesh; for the rest they have soft hands. They have some modest fleshiness around the thumbs, which stand out by their size. They are seen to have palms which lack all roughness; it is even so that the higher proportion of sanguinic complexion a mortal has, the larger is the thickness at the base of his thumb, and the fingertips are rendered more slender. (...) Sanguinics surpass others in looseness of the tongue for pronouncing and articulating words: the sound of their speech lies between average and thin in pitch and roughness. A sweet singing-voice has been denied them by nature, for they normally sing with a goatly throat (the term is derived from goat).

Monte's description in *Collectanea* is much shorter:

*Sanguinei vero has factiones habent: faciem videlicet quae ad magnitudinem et mediocritatem tendit aliquanto carnosusculam, maxime respective ad ossa sua, et etiam in longitudine brevem. Caput neque magnum neque parvum. Collum bono modo grossum, humeros extensos vel longos ad partem brachiorum. Musculum brachiorum et crura tibiæ grossa, genua et cubitus inferius graciles respective ad superiores partes crurum et musculorum. Manus vero curtas et tactui teneras, punctas digitorum duriusculas atque strictas. Palmulas manus parumper grossas et carniū plenas, sed respective ad molliciem manuum omnes aliae carnes sive membra duriciem pandunt, et aspectu quidem pulchrae. (...) Bonam habent pronuntiationem, vocem tamen scabrosam aut asperiusculam.*

(*Collectanea*, lib. 1, cap. 34, f. 21)

Sanguinics have this makeup, namely a face which tends towards large and medium size and is somewhat fleshy, especially in respect of its bones, and is also short in length. The head is neither big nor small. The neck is thick in good measure, the shoulders extended or long towards the arms. The upper arms and the thighs are thick; below the knees and elbows they are slender compared to the upper legs and arms. The hands are short and tender to the touch, the fingertips somewhat hard and tight. The handpalms are somewhat thick and full of flesh, but in respect of the softness of the hands, all other flesh or limbs display hardness,



and are beautiful indeed to the sight. (...) They have a good pronunciation, but a rough, or somewhat gruff, voice.

Contrary to Ayora who as a rule adheres to classical Latin syntax,<sup>20</sup> Monte does not shun from non-classical turns, such as respective *ad, bono modo grossum*, and *parumper grossas* (*parumper* being used in the non-classical meaning of ‘a little’, ‘rather’). Furthermore, Ayora clearly strives for more syntactical variation than is to be found in Monte’s rather monotonous text. Both Ayora and Monte have a strong predilection for the diminutive suffix *-iusculus* (‘somewhat’) which is rare in classical and even in medieval Latin.<sup>21</sup> Ayora occasionally dears to coin new nouns, such as *pulpecula* (derived from the classical *pulpa*, ‘solid flesh’) and *corpulentiuscula* (derived from the classical but rare *corpulentia*). And although he is compelled to resort to the anatomical terminology as it has developed in the medieval medical tradition, he sometimes avoids a term deemed too unclassical to be wholly acceptable. This is notably the case with the word *musculus*, used by Monte in the specific non-classical meaning of upper arm.<sup>22</sup>

The linguistic differences between Ayora and Monte are perhaps even more outspoken in their description of specific fighting techniques, such as the ‘cargo’, a Spanish wrestling term for which Ayora proposes the Latin equivalent *oneratio*, a late Latin word derived from the classical verb *onerare* (‘loading’).<sup>23</sup>

<sup>20</sup> There are admittedly some exceptions, such as the syntactic combination of *abinvicem* (a word stemming from late Antiquity; cf. Alexander Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.* [Oxford, 1949], p. 1) and *comparare* instead of the more classical turn *inter se comparare*.

<sup>21</sup> Apart from the classical but rare *duriusculus*, words like *grossiusculae*, *asperiuscula* (Ayora) and *asperiusculam* (Monte) do not appear in the dictionaries of classical and medieval Latin that can be searched through the Database of Latin Dictionaries (Brepolis). It should be added that the lavish use of suffixes, as well as of prefixes, in order to form new words is a typical feature of medieval Latin. Cf. Richard Sharpe, *Vocabulary, Word Formation, and Lexicography*, in Mantello – Rigg, *Medieval Latin* (as in n. 7), pp. 93–105 (esp. 94).

<sup>22</sup> *Collectanea*, lib. 1, cap. 76, f. 40: *Supra cubitum molledo et grossitudo circa humeros musculi vel tori (vocantur)*. Cf. *Latinitas Italica*, in Database of Latin Dictionaries, s.v. *musculus*. Readiness to change the meaning of existing words is, again, a typical feature of medieval Latin; cf. Sharpe, *Vocabulary* (as in n. 21), p. 93. In her analysis of Monte’s anatomical nomenclature in *Comment Pietro del Monte, condottiere italien, parlait espagnol* (as in n. 1), Marie-Madeleine Fontaine overlooks this specific meaning when she simply subsumes the term under the category of ‘Latin classique’ (p. 172).

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.* (as in n. 20), p. 277. The term *cargo* does not appear in Francisco Gago-Jover, *Vocabulario militar castellano* (siglos XIII–XV) (Granada, 2002), which unfortunately does not take into account physical exercises like wrestling which Monte deemed crucial for a good preparation to combat in war. Cf. Anglo, *The Man Who Taught Leonardo Darts* (as in n. 1), pp. 271–272 and id., *The Martial Arts* (as in n. 1), pp. 283–284.

*Lumbos auctores ad hostem vertunt: quo in tempore eius brachium quod supra collum est capiunt, quod tunc rumpi posse verendum est, vel idem supra caput vertere corrumpereque etiam possunt, contra quos cum puncta pedis sacalignam<sup>24</sup> agere eandem manum inclinantes maxime decet.*

(*De dignoscendis hominibus*, lib. 5, f. 176<sup>r</sup>)

Those who perform it turn their loins towards the enemy and, at the same time, take hold of his arm which lies over the neck; it then runs the risk of being broken. Or they can also turn that arm over the head and break it. To counter them, it is extremely suitable to employ a *sacaligna* with the point of the foot, when they bend that hand down.

As usual, Monte's description is much more concise:

*Cargum vel onerationem dicimus brachium alterius accipiendo et tergum nostrum supra alvum eius evolvimus et quod declinando corpus nostrum ipse super humeros nostros cadat.*

(*Collectanea*, lib. 1, cap. 1, f. 10)

*Cargum* or *oneratio* we call it when we take the opponent's arm and roll our back over his belly, and when we bend our body away, he falls over our shoulders.

Monte's text is so condense as to become syntactically weird; the main verb *dicimus* is connected with (a) the gerund *accipiendo*, which seems to be loosely linked to the verb *evolvimus* by means of the connector *et*, and (b) the subordinate clause introduced by *quod* whose verb *cadat* is put in the subjunctive, possibly to denote a consecutive meaning. Whatever the exact construction, the sentence can only be deemed solecistic. To put it mildly, Monte's Latin proves to be anything but classical.<sup>25</sup>

Although the *Collectanea* can, at least partly and to a certain extent, be considered a kind of 'intra-lingual' translation of *De dignoscendis hominibus*, a rather drastic adaptation as far as language and style are concerned, the latter work was in all likelihood not the only, nor even the main, subtext on which the new treatise was based. As Sydney Anglo has argued, Monte wrote his *Collectanea* as early as the 1480s or 1490s, and certainly no later than 1496.<sup>26</sup> At that

<sup>24</sup> *Sacaligna* is a wrestling term derived from the vernacular denoting a hooking movement directed to the back of the opponent's knee. Cf. Anglo, *The Martial Arts* (as in n. 1), p. 198. It is not found in Gago-Jover, *Vocabulario militar* (as in n. 23).

<sup>25</sup> Pace J. Clements in his article – in fact an exceedingly enthusiastic review of Anglo's *The Martial Arts* (as in n. 1) – Pietro Monte – from Medieval to Renaissance Master ... once again, [www.thearma.org/essays/Monte.htm](http://www.thearma.org/essays/Monte.htm).

<sup>26</sup> In a chapter on light armour (lib. 2, cap. 128), Monte states that during the time he was composing his work (f. 95: *in tempore quo ego componebam hoc opus*), Duke Sigismund of Aus-

time, he was still in the process of mastering the Latin language. It is fair to assume that his command of the language was still rather poor at that stage, perhaps too poor to write his technical treatise in Latin right from the start.<sup>27</sup> There is good reason to assume, then, that Monte first composed his text, or at the very least a rough outline of it, in Spanish, the language he had used to write the original version of *De dignoscendis*, the language he was, moreover, familiar with as a teacher of the martial arts. As Ayora emphasizes in *De dignoscendis hominibus*, in his days the Spanish masters of arms were most advanced in the development of new fighting techniques, and had coined a more or less consistent terminology to describe and analyze them.<sup>28</sup> Therefore it is only natural that the soldier and self-made scholar Monte, still grappling with the niceties of the Latin language, resorted to Spanish to write a first draft of his vast work on the martial arts. This hypothesis is perhaps confirmed by a passage from the *Collectanea* in which Monte explicitly tells his readers that he wrote his book primarily in Spanish, for instance when dealing with wrestling.<sup>29</sup> A less equivocal statement is to be found in the prologue to *De singulari certamine sive dissensione*, a treatise on dueling which Monte dedicated to the future emperor Charles V and which the Milanese printer Scinzeler released on 31 August 1509 – only five weeks after the posthumous edition of the *Collecta-*

---

tria, Galeazzo da Sanseverino and Claude de Vaudray from Burgundy were seeking after different types of armour. The year in which Archduke Sigismund of Austria died, 1496, provides a *terminus ante quem*. Cf. Anglo, *The Martial Arts* (as in n. 1), p. 214.

<sup>27</sup> As Marie-Madeleine Fontaine has demonstrated, Monte did not choose Latin as his preferred medium of scholarly communication until 1507. Cf. *Le condottiere Pietro del Monte* (as in n. 1), p. 16 and *Comment Pietro del Monte, condottiere italien, parlait espagnol* (as in n. 1), p. 173.

<sup>28</sup> *De dignoscendis*, lib. 1, *Argumentum*, f. 9: ... *variae corporis exercitationes ... nuper inventae, quarum nominibus non solum antiqui Latini caruere homines, verum nunc Itali ea magna ex parte ignorant. Idcirco ab Hispano idiomate illa petere decet, cuius sonus adeo Romanae linguae cognatus atque contiguus est, ut Romanae merito appelletur, quo nomine Hispani utimur*. Cf. Monte's praise of Ayora's labor in translating his work: *At si liber quispiam laborem interpreti attulit, hic partem suam sortitur, quum non solum exercitia ea disserere videatur, quae in illis regionibus ignorantur in quibus corporis apitudo negligitur, verum ea quae in Hispania reperiuntur, ubi tantopere huiusmodi res frequentari solent, quae plurima novitate notanda videri poterunt* (*De dignoscendis*, lib. 1, cap. 34, f. 22). On the lack of a veritable *lingua franca* in the field of early modern martial arts, see Anglo, *The Martial Arts* (as in n. 1), p. 39 and 177.

<sup>29</sup> *Collectanea*, lib. 1, cap. 1, f. 10: *Saltem de Hyspano idiomate multa dicemus, eo quod in primis hunc libellum in ipso scripsimus, sicut de industria et stratagemate luctandi*. Anglo, *The Martial Arts* (as in n. 1), p. 39 attributes a temporal meaning to *in primis* and takes the passage to mean that Monte 'explains why many of these (sc. technical terms) derive from Spanish, the language in which the book was originally written' (my italics). However, *in primis* can also mean 'especially', 'mainly', 'chiefly' (cf. Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary* [Oxford, 1984], p. 1444, s.v. *primus*, II.B), in which case Monte states that he 'especially' used Spanish as a language to describe and analyze such technical matters as wrestling techniques.

*nea*. In the prologue the author announces that he will translate his book from Castilian into Latin, just as he has previously done with his works on exercises, the military art, and proverbs.<sup>30</sup> As Anglo has rightly pointed out, the ‘works on exercises and the military art’ unambiguously refer to the three books of the *Collectanea*.<sup>31</sup>

In short, the *Collectanea* are primarily to be considered a Latin translation or adaptation of a Spanish subtext. Contrary to *De dignoscendis*, however, both subtext and translation were written by Monte himself. It should be added that this does not necessarily apply to the entire treatise, as Anglo concludes rather hastily. Contrary to her colleague, Marie-Madeleine Fontaine has argued that possibly only some older passages from the *Collectanea* are derived from a Spanish original,<sup>32</sup> thereby implying that Monte continued to work, albeit perhaps intermittently, on his treatise after 1496 and that the newer parts of it may well have been written in Latin right from the start. It is safe to conclude, then, that the *Collectanea* are truly a multilayered text, which was partly based on a Latin model (*De dignoscendis hominibus*), partly composed on the basis of Spanish notes, and perhaps partly written in Latin from scratch.

The translator as commentator and co-author

Despite the stark contrast between the fairly fluent, humanist Latin of *De dignoscendis hominibus* and the rather idiosyncratic Latin that characterizes the *Collectanea*, it is hard to underestimate the lasting influence that Gonzalo de Ayora exerted on Monte as an author-translator. Not only did Ayora convince his friend of the importance of publishing in Latin in order to reach an international cultured readership, he also made him painfully aware of the arduous task entailed in describing fighting exercises and techniques in the ancients' tongue. Last but not least, Ayora's own efforts to find appropriate Latin equivalents to the many vernacular technical terms used by Monte in the original Spanish manuscript of *De dignoscendis* provided the latter with a useful, if not indispensable, model for his own work as an author-translator of the *Collectanea*. As we shall see, Monte dutifully acknowledged his debt to his old friend in the prologue to the *Collectanea*, approved of his general translation

<sup>30</sup> *De singulari certamine, prologus*, f. iv<sup>v</sup>: *Et quoniam in hoc libro de materia ad multos spectante tractamus, in lingua latina ex castellana ipsum trademus, quemadmodum et in quibusdam aliis tractatibus egimus, quemadmodum in exercitijs, arte militari et proverbiijs*. We consulted a copy extant in the National Library of Austria, shelf number 52.C.14\*.

<sup>31</sup> Anglo, *The Man Who Taught Leonardo Darts* (as in n. 1), pp. 265–266. The hypothesis may – or may not – be corroborated by manuscript evidence as well, depending on one's interpretation of the handwritten copy entitled *‘Ejercicios de las Armas’* which is preserved in the Real Biblioteca de Madrid. See n. 3.

<sup>32</sup> Comment Pietro del Monte, condottiere italien, parlait espagnol (as in n. 1), p. 173: „de longs fragments anciens des Exercitiorum collectanae (sic)“.

strategy, and took over many of the Latin terms which Ayora had coined. However, a detailed analysis of the lexical level of both *De dignoscendis* and *Collectanea* will reveal some glaring differences between them – a point that has been overlooked by Sidney Anglo and Marie-Madeleine Fontaine in their pioneering works on Monte.

In the *De dignoscendis hominibus*, Monte pays tribute to Ayora's hard labour as a translator, albeit in a general and circuitous way, by devoting an entire chapter to the interesting question of whose work is to be considered more difficult: that of authors or that of translators and commentators?<sup>33</sup> Monte readily admits that in many respects the latter face a more arduous task. In order to be successful, they have to strictly observe the meaning of the source text, which Monte deems nearly impossible if there is no author present who can explain his intention 'in living words'.<sup>34</sup> While this problem occurs to both translators and commentators of older work, especially that of the classical authors, translators are confronted with the additional difficulty of having to master both the source and target language in order to produce a sufficiently elegant text.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, their task is seriously complicated by the inevitable poverty of language, in general, and the incongruity of languages, more particularly. Monte proves this point by taking biology as an example. While the earth counts more plants and animals than are covered by current names in any language, the same plant or animal often receives a completely different name by people living in distant regions and using another language.<sup>36</sup> However, this problem is to a certain extent alleviated by the closely related phenomena of linguistic interchange and mutual conformation: especially in the field of herbs and cattle, Monte says, one language tends to take over the names current in another one.<sup>37</sup> But even when that does not appear to be the case and the source text contains obscure words for which no suitable equivalent is readily available in the target language, a translator can always make use of circumlocution

<sup>33</sup> Lib. 1, cap. xxxiv, f. 42<sup>r</sup>–43<sup>r</sup>: *Quidnam difficilius sit: an nova opera edere, an vel aliena interpretari vel commentari, quas quoque differentias auctores cum ipsis interpretibus abinvicem habeant.*

<sup>34</sup> Lib. 1, cap. xxxiv, f. 42<sup>r</sup>: *Id (...) imprimis animadvertendum est an auctoris ipsius intentionem semper observent; quae res pene impossibilis apparet, si ab eo interpretes ipsi maiorem sui operis intentionem vivis verbis non intellexerunt.*

<sup>35</sup> Lib. 1, cap. xxxiv, f. 43<sup>r</sup>: *Ratio ipsa id agi debere ostendit interpretes ea quae convertunt eleganti oratione edere, quum id praecipuum intendant et a pluribus libris iuventur.*

<sup>36</sup> Lib. 1, cap. xxxiv, f. 42<sup>v</sup>: *Nimium (...) perarduum videtur (...) vocabula omnia ex una in aliam locutionem transferre, si id praesertim adiungas, quod sensu ipso appraehenditur, quovis in sermone nominum penuriam esse. Maior enim quavis in parte et plantarum et animalium numerus est quam eorum nomina quae in usu habentur. At quamvis quaeque res nomen obtineat, non eodem apud omnes cognominatur. In quinque milium enim passuum distantia res easdem cum discrimine nominari videmus.*

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.: *Eorum labor tum minuitur quum ex alterius sermonis quam plurima alternis nominibus nomina conformari videamus in herbis maxime atque pecudibus.*

(*circuitio, ambitus verborum*). According to Monte, it is an option available to translators only; authors are not allowed to resort to this specific device:

*Quando haec copia nobis deesset, id non nimium difficile occurrit obscura vocabula circuitione clarescere vel ea quae omnino desint ambitu verborum explicare; quae res novarum rerum auctoribus minime licet* (f. 42<sup>v</sup>).

When we should lack that opportunity, a possibility, which is not overly difficult, offers itself to clarify obscure terms, or explain those for which there is no word at all, by circumlocution. This is not allowed for the authors of the originals.

What holds true for plant and animal names, does not necessarily apply to other semantic fields. Monte is acutely aware of the fact that the translation of a text dealing with the martial arts puts an even heavier burden on the translator's shoulders:

*Si liber quispiam laborem interpreti attulit, hic partem suam sortitur, quum non solum exercitia ea disserere videatur, quae in illis regionibus ignorantur in quibus corporis aptitudo negligitur, verum ea quae in Hispania reperiuntur, ubi tantopere huiusmodi res frequentari solent, quam plurima novitate notanda videri poterunt* (f. 42<sup>v</sup>).

If some book has given the translator difficulties, he certainly gets his share here, as he is seen not just to treat those exercises which are unknown in those areas where bodily fitness is neglected; but even a very great deal of the exercises which are found in Spain, where things of this kind are practiced so very frequently, can be regarded as deserving to be marked as new.

Monte's explanation is quite revealing. First of all, it contains a clear, if largely implicit, justification for his choice of Spanish as the linguistic tool to convey his knowledge of physical and military exercises. If anywhere, it is in Spain that those exercises were held in high esteem and practiced on a large scale. Second, it reveals that Spanish, while being by far the best linguistic option available to Monte, was not entirely satisfactory either: many of the fighting techniques the author was eager to describe and analyze were new and consequently, so we can safely infer, lacked a precise and stable terminology even in that language. Last but not least, Monte unambiguously acknowledges Ayora's hard work as a translator: his task was exceedingly difficult – more difficult than any other translator's job had ever been.

Monte's view on the translator's task and methods can easily be summarized. The task of a translator appears to be twofold: while he has to remain faithful to the author's intention, he should also aim at improving the original text by

striving for elegance. In other words, faithful rendering and stylistic emulation should go hand in hand. When faced with technical terms in the source language, the translator should try to find appropriate equivalents in the target language or even coin new ones. If he proves unable to do so, he is recommended to circumscribe and explain obscure terms. In short, Monte proves to adhere to a rather ‚liberal‘, perhaps even typically humanist, conception of the translator’s task, allowing space for literary creativity and ingenuity in finding new words. At least implicitly, Monte distances himself from the more dominant discourse on translation in early modern times, which conceived the translator’s job as a humble, self-effacing activity, strictly limited to conveying the intent of the source text as scrupulously as possible by sticking to a literal, i.e. word for word translation.<sup>38</sup>

Monte’s view was fully endorsed and loyally executed by Ayora when trying to convert Monte’s Spanish manuscript into a smooth Latin treatise sufficiently attuned to humanist ears. This is not surprising as there is good reason to assume that Monte was heavily inspired by his friend with whom he closely collaborated during his laborious translation work and may well have functioned as his mouthpiece. It is quite evident from Ayora’s translation and his comments on his work as a translator that he did not regard faithful rendering and stylistic improvement of the source text as being incompatible or mutually exclusive; both tasks can and should be executed simultaneously in order to make the original text more intelligible and palatable for the target readership he has in mind. As Ayora explains in one of the many justificatory or even purely apologetic passages which he inserted into the text, he considered it to be his main task to elucidate the author’s intention, and admitted that he was only capable of doing so because he had received proper instruction from him.<sup>39</sup> Still, he often felt compelled to expand the original text (*verbis dilatare*) in order to reach his goal. This he achieved not only by resorting to the typically humanist rhetorical strategies of amplification and variation, but also, and

---

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Theo Hermans, The Task of the Translator in the European Renaissance: Explorations in a Discursive Field, in Susan Bassnett (ed.), *Translating Literature* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 14–40; see also id., Renaissance Translation between Literalism and Imitation, in Harald Kittel (ed.), *Geschichte, System, literarische Übersetzung / Histories, Systems, Literary Translations* (Berlin, 1992), pp. 95–116. As Peter Burke has pointed out, there was a notable discrepancy between the rather strict dominant discourse and the actual practice of translation in the 16th century; the latter was often „extremely or even scandalously free by modern standards“; cf. his article The Renaissance Translator as Go-Between, in Andreas Höfele – Werner von Koppenfels (eds.), *Renaissance Go-Betweens: Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe*, *Spectrum Literature* (Berlin, 2005), pp. 18–31 (p. 25).

<sup>39</sup> *De dignoscendis hominibus, praefacio*, f. 8<sup>r</sup>: *Verum quia in ea ipsa ab auctore haud parum eruditus sim, eius mentem planius caeteris explanare posse existimavi.*

perhaps more interestingly so, by consciously combining the role of a translator with that of a commentator<sup>40</sup> – a fusion of tasks which was deemed unacceptable in the dominant (non-humanist) discourse on translation prevailing at the time.<sup>41</sup>

As a commentator, Ayora regularly interspersed the text with his own glosses. These he used to describe in more detail a particular physical exercise or trick discussed by Monte, to explain and justify the Latin equivalent he proposed for a particular technical term in the vernacular,<sup>42</sup> but occasionally also to add his own observations on the subject-matter at hand. This is notably the case in chapter 31 of book 1, in which Ayora offers a long-winded description of the entire world's moral corruption. This personal comment was clearly triggered by Monte's previous complaints in chapter 30 about the wickedness of lawyers: as the author contemptuously states, no oration, however long, suffices to explain their crimes.<sup>43</sup> Sometimes, Ayora the commentator even dares to enter Monte's recognized field of expertise. Thus he feels sufficiently knowledgeable to add a personal note to his friend's exposition of the rules of wrestling as they existed in various countries.<sup>44</sup> This example is particularly interesting as it is not altogether clear where exactly Ayora ends his personal digression and resumes his task of translating Monte's original text; translation and commentary seem to blend into each other.

This passage seems to announce a major turning-point in the translation of book 5, devoted to the martial arts. In the previous chapter, dealing with wrestling, Ayora painstakingly executed his double task as a translator and commentator. Whenever Monte introduced a specific term in Spanish to analyze a particular wrestling technique, Ayora went to the trouble of finding an appropriate Latin equivalent and of giving a more detailed description. As he explains in a lengthy gloss, he felt obliged to do so as he deemed Monte's text

---

<sup>40</sup> Cf. *ibid.*: ... *ipsius sententiis concipiendis recteque commentandis*.

<sup>41</sup> See the literature quoted in n. 38. For a more theoretical approach to the relationship between translation and commentary, see especially Maryvonne Boisseau (ed.), *De la traduction comme commentaire au commentaire de traduction*, *Palimpsestes* 20 (Paris, 2007).

<sup>42</sup> For an interesting parallel, see Peter Burke's discussion of the Latin translation of Castiglione's *Cortegiano* by Bartholomew Clerke in *Translations into Latin in Early Modern Europe*, in Peter Burke – R. Po-Chia Hsia (eds.), *Cultural translation in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 65–80 (p. 79).

<sup>43</sup> *Lib. 1, cap. xxx: Nullam usque tam copiosam orationem esse quae iurisperitorum scelera sufficienter explicet*; *lib. 1, cap. xxxi: Totius orbis corrupti mores coacervatim tanguntur*. Tellingly, Ayora's amplification is preceded by an apologetic note (*interpretis excusatio*).

<sup>44</sup> *Interpres*, in *lib. 5, cap. 4, membrum iii (Quae leges in palaestra convenienter observari debeant)*, ff. 182<sup>v</sup>–183<sup>r</sup>.



unintelligible, not only for learned men who – understandably enough – were unfamiliar with the finer details of the martial arts, but also for Spanish readers whom he expected to be insufficiently acquainted with Monte's apparently rather new and idiosyncratic terminology.<sup>45</sup> In his efforts to elucidate the text, Ayora needed to hone his talents as a humanist. Quite often he found an acceptable equivalent in classical Latin which, however, required further explanation in order to be fully understood. As we have seen, he proposed the Latin word *oneratio* as an equivalent to the Spanish term 'cargo' and added an accurate description of the technique which the term denoted. Likewise, he suggested the perfectly classical word *rotatio* to translate the Spanish term 'torno' (a particular kind of trip, entailing a rotating or gyrating movement of the foot), thereby implicitly rejecting the medieval Latin equivalent *tornus*.<sup>46</sup> Sometimes he coined a new word according to the rules of classical Latin word formation, such as *anguigera* (lit. 'carrying or conducting like a snake'), a neologism of which Ayora must have been rather proud as it almost graphically depicts the bodily movement it is meant to denote. Modeled on the classical word *anguifer* ('serpent-bearing'), it is proposed as a classical alternative to the more common Latinized word *mediana*, denoting a kind of trip whereby one wraps one's leg around one of the opponent's, as it were 'in the manner of a snake'.<sup>47</sup> Despite his considerable efforts, Ayora was not always able to maintain the high humanist standards he had set for himself. In some cases he was simply forced to Latinize vernacular terms, a solution for which he profusely apologized towards his readers. Thus he somewhat reluctantly adopted the

<sup>45</sup> Lib. 5, cap. 4, f. 173<sup>r</sup>: *Nam huiusmodi particulae quum nudis hispanorum, imo ipsiusmet auctoris nominibus tactae sint, non solum a doctis hominibus ab iisdem rebus remotis, verum ab omni pene hispanorum gente abesse atque ignorari poterunt.*

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Ducange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, in Database of Latin Dictionaries, s.v. *tornus* (3), having the rather broad meaning of *ambitus*. The word *tornus* does appear in classical Latin, albeit in the very specific meaning of 'a turner's wheel or lathe'; cf. Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (n. 29), s.v. *tornus*, p. 1879. Ayora defines *rotatio* as follows: *Altero pede nostro pene inter suos constituto, altero praeterea hostis crus unum obviatur, cuius dominum brachia nostra supra eundem obstantem pedem usque ad ruinam cum ingenti undatione deportant* (lib. 5, cap. 4, f. 174<sup>v</sup>). As a wrestling term, *torno* is conspicuously absent in Gago-Jover, *Vocabulario militar castellano* (as in n. 23), pp. 337–338, where the term is only defined as a kind of armament – a meaning which the medieval Latin word *tornus* had also acquired; cf. Ducange, *Glossarium*, s.v. *tornus* (1).

<sup>47</sup> Lib. 5, cap. 4, f. 175<sup>r</sup>: *Medianam itaque magnam illam hispani dicunt, quando alterum crus alterum sibi adversum serpentis more per interiorum partem implicat, quam ob rem eandem, si velis, anguigeram non iniuria dixeris.* Cf. lib. 5, cap. 4, f. 176<sup>v</sup>: *... medianam (sic) etiam magnam quam anguigeram appellari per convenientiam et posse et debere docuimus.* On the use of neologisms as a translational method to fill lexical gaps in early modern times, see esp. Frederick M. Renner, *Interpretatio. Language and Translation from Cicero to Tytler*, *Approaches to Translation Studies*, 8 (Amsterdam – Atlanta, GA, 1989), pp. 104–108.

Spanish word ,armar‘ and turned it into the Latin verb *armare*, homonymous with the classical verb *armare* (,to furnish with weapons, to arm‘) but bearing a completely different meaning. As Ayora explains in a lengthy gloss, the Spanish word ,armar‘ can mean either ,to arm‘ or ,to lure an animal or an adversary into an ambush‘. Undoubtedly following Monte’s lead, he announces that, in the context of wrestling exercises, the word will be used to denote, even more specifically, ambushing an enemy in such a way that he falls into the ambush and sinks to the ground.<sup>48</sup>

From chapter 5 of book 5 onwards, Monte embarks on an elaborate discussion of exercises required for successful mounted combat. And it is precisely here that we observe a remarkable change in Ayora’s translational strategy. The change is duly announced in an apologetic gloss which deserves to be quoted in full:

*Nunc me quam plurima nova atque incognita nomina dicere exemplar imperat, quorum nonnulla explicabimus, sed reliqua, quum non nisi in ipsa arte versatis hominibus convenient, sine quibus litterati homines particulam hanc intelligere omnino dubito, omittemus; quam quippe ob rem multum ibi vel temporis vel laboris consumere, dum illa dilucido, nequaquam spero. Quapropter etiam nomen nostrum ibi crebro intromittere minime curabimus.*

(lib. 5, cap. 6, *interpres*, f. 185<sup>v</sup>)

Now the original commands me to mention an enormous number of new and unknown names. We shall explain some of them, but omit the rest, since they suit only those men who engage in the art itself, without whom I doubt altogether whether educated men can understand this section; this is indeed the reason why I hope not to spend much time or labour at all here in clarifying them. And for that reason, too, we will take very little care to frequently insert our name there.

It is altogether clear that Ayora abandons his double task of translating and commenting upon Monte’s Spanish manuscript. At the same time, he refrains from systematically explaining all the new technical terms with which Monte has larded his Spanish account. Two reasons are adduced for this quite dramatic shift: lack of time and lack of relevance for the educated readership to whose tastes Ayora has been catering thus far to the best of his abilities. The

<sup>48</sup> Lib. 5, cap. 4, f. 173<sup>v</sup>: *Quum vero armare adoptivum ab hispano sermone verbum inter reliqua latina a nobis paulo altius insertum sit, quid sub ipso intelligatur, ut lectoribus et auctoris sensus et mei excusatio pateat, explicari decet. (...) Hoc in loco non solum insidias tendere, verum iis eodem in instanti expositis hostes ut in ipsis incidant atque corruant, obnixè compellere debemus.* On the use of direct borrowing in early modern translations, which was common but by no means unquestioned, see Renier, *Interpretation* (as in n. 47), pp. 99–103.

first reason was in all likelihood no cheap and dishonest excuse, as Ayora elsewhere insists that he was forced to work under too high a time pressure to execute his task in a completely satisfactory manner.<sup>49</sup> The second reason is more interesting, in so far as it betrays a sense of failure, perhaps even of disillusionment. No matter how hard Ayora has worked on Monte's manuscript in order to turn it into a fluent Latin treatise, in the end it proves to be too technical to be understood, let alone fully appreciated, by educated men deeply steeped in humanist culture. Ayora's assessment was probably painfully correct. For although humanist pedagogues such as Maffeo Vegio, Pietro Paulo Vergerio, and others insisted on the usefulness of physical exercise and even gave some room to training in combat skills in their educational programmes, their description of physical exercises remained rather superficial. However important those exercises were to foster healthy young men capable of defending their country, they were at any rate subordinate to the far more crucial moral and intellectual training of youngsters. Monte's very detailed and highly technical analysis of literally all the martial arts went far beyond the scope and interest of most, if not all, humanists.<sup>50</sup>

Ayora's shift in translation policy has left clear marks in the Latin text he produced. From chapter 5 of book 5 onwards ever more Spanish technical terms emerge without translation or explanation. At the very beginning of the chapter on vaulting, Ayora limits himself to indicating the generic Spanish term for it:

*Voltear atque trepar illa exercitia in primis hispani appellant, quorum illud diversas conversiones super equum vel mulam agere, istud vero aut in terra aut super funem facere docet.*  
(Lib. 5, cap. 5, f. 185<sup>v</sup>)

<sup>49</sup> See e.g. lib. 5, G. *Ayora proboemium*, f. 171<sup>v</sup>: *In eis etenim interpretandis parum amplius profecto temporis exposui, quam ad idem opus satis celeri calamo transcribendum necesse habuissem.*

<sup>50</sup> For a nuanced account of the relationship between humanists and Renaissance masters of arms, see Anglo, *The Martial Arts* (as in n. 1), pp. 27–30. John Clements goes too far in finding a solid common ideological ground in humanist educational treatises and combat manuals in his article *The Humanist Component within Renaissance Martial Arts Teachings*, *Journal of Martial Arts Anthropology*, 11.2 (2011), 32–37. For the gradual separation in early modern times of military exercises and physical exercises for reasons of health and relaxation, see Sébastien Jahan, *Les renaissances du corps en Occident (1450–1650)*, *Histoire & Société* (Paris, 2004), pp. 169–173. On the impact of humanism on the court arts in general, see the sobering remarks by Sydney Anglo in *Humanism and the Court Arts*, in Anthony Goodman – Angus MacKay (eds.), *The Impact of Humanism on Western Europe* (London – New York, 1990), pp. 66–98.

*Voltear* and *trepas* those exercises are called, especially by the Spanish, of which the first teaches how to perform various turns on a horse or mule, while the second teaches how to do so on the ground or on a rope.

No Latin equivalents are given, no effort is even made to Latinize the vernacular terms. Continuing his description of vaulting, Ayora does feel the need to naturalize a foreign word like *voltear* by modifying its ending and conjugating it according to the rules of classical Latin:

*Ad recte vero volteandum (ut hispanorum nomen [sic] iterum repetam) et cum aura atque gratia quae requiritur pauci sunt (ibidem).*<sup>51</sup>

But few can voltear correctly (to repeat the Spanish name once again) and with the required lightness and grace.

However, Ayora cannot always refrain from displaying his humanist erudition and occasionally takes the opportunity to suggest a classical word which he deems appropriate:

*Quum in ipsa praeterea trepatione (cuius artifices petauros apud maiores appellatos invenio) saltare oportet, sanguineis, colericis, melancholicis vis non contemnenda inest (ibidem).*

For the rest, when one should jump in the *trepatio* itself (whose performers, I find, were called *petauri* by the ancients), sanguinics, choleric, and melancholics have a power which is not to be despised.

*Trepatio* is, of course, a borrowing from the Spanish (la trepa). *Petaurus*, however, is not derived from the vernacular. It is presented here as a good Latin name to denote vaulters. This is not entirely correct. The word does not occur in the major dictionaries of classical or medieval Latin. It is listed by Antonius Nebrissensis (Antonio de Lebrija) in his Latin-Spanish dictionary of 1492, albeit to denote the activity of vaulting, rather than the actor or executer.<sup>52</sup> Classical Latin did have a special name for a vaulter or rope-dancer: *petaurista* or *petauristes*, a rather uncommon word derived from *petaurum* (a stage or spring-board used by tumblers and rope-dancers) which is mentioned and explained by the grammarians Nonius Marcellus and Sextus Pompeius Festus in the second century AD.<sup>53</sup>

It is very unlikely that it is Monte who came across the word *petaurus*; it is much safer to assume that the discovery was made by the young humanist Ayora who could not resist inserting his learned remark into the Latin text.

<sup>51</sup> On this translational procedure, see Renier, *Interpretatio* (as in n. 47), pp. 101–103.

<sup>52</sup> Antonius Nebrissensis, *Latin-Spanish Dictionary* (1492), through Database of Latin Dictionaries, s.v. *petaurus*: ‘i por la trepa juego’.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (as in n. 29), p. 1364.

This observation indicates that Ayora's change of translation policy also involved a radical change in the status of the Latin text he was producing. Whereas in the previous chapters Ayora took great pains to carefully separate his personal comments from his translation of Monte's text, no clear distinction between the author's and the commentator's text can be made any longer in the following chapters. From chapter 5 of book 5 onwards, the Latin text as it was published and offered to an international readership appears to be a hybrid text, a text co-authored by Monte and Ayora.

However that may be, Ayora was well aware of the fact that the Latin text which he produced diverged considerably from the original Spanish version made by Monte. In a way, it could be considered a new work.<sup>54</sup> This is probably the reason why Monte and Ayora decided to provide the Latin treatise with two dedications (one by Monte to prince Juan and another by Ayora to queen Isabel of Spain) and to write separate introductions to each and single book of it. Tellingly, Ayora's dedication and forewords invariably precede the ones written by Monte.

The author as translator: the lexical level

Contrary to the *De dignoscendis hominibus*, the *Collectanea* were authored by one person only. Even though interventions may have been made by the printer Scinzenzeler, or possibly by his former friend Sanseverino to whom the work was dedicated, in order to make Monte's manuscript ready for posthumous publication, the printed book merely featured one name – that of Petrus Montius. When writing his Latin treatise or, perhaps more accurately, converting his Spanish notes into a coherent Latin treatise, Monte was confronted with the same translation problems which had vexed Ayora before. The real crux was this: how to describe modern and rapidly evolving fighting techniques in such a way that they could be understood by specialist and non-specialist readers alike? While uneducated soldiers (*indocti litterarum*) were familiar enough with the vernacular, predominantly Spanish terminology that had established itself in the course of time, men of letters (*sequentes litteras*) could not be expected to be sufficiently acquainted with it. As Monte was eager to address this readership as well, he had no choice but to resort to Latin as his means of communication. However, the author / translator was acutely aware of the impracticability of this seemingly obvious and easy solution – probably more aware of, and certainly more outspoken about, it than Ayora

<sup>54</sup> Cf. *De dignoscendis*, G. Ayorae praefacio ad Elisabeth Hispaniarum reginam, f. 9<sup>v</sup>: ... qui utroque sermone cognito librum ipsum perlegerint, quibus sane apparere non dubito me ex iisdem rebus librum quoquo modo dissimilem edidisse, quem non minori diligentia pro temporis brevitae coram te romana in lingua loquentem ire volui, quam auctor is qui summo cum labore atque industria miro artificio fabricatum filio tuo dicaverit.

had been. In fact, the ancients' tongue proved to be eminently unsuited for his purposes. While classical Roman writers such as Vegetius had some valuable things to say about the proper way of conducting a war (the subject matter dealt with in book 3 of the *Collectanea*) and consequently had bequeathed a military vocabulary that, at least to a certain extent, remained useful to Monte and other contemporary writers, this was simply not the case with the martial arts which early modern soldiers had to master in order to stand their ground in war. With the notable exception of defensive weapons,<sup>55</sup> the Latin language appeared to be lacking precise terms needed to describe wrestling, foot combat and mounted combat, sword fighting, and the proper use of other offensive weapons.<sup>56</sup> To put it more poignantly, Latin proved to be poor and unstable at the same time. Some important terms were simply unavailable, while others were too vague or ambiguous to reach the kind of precision that Monte rightly deemed crucial for his endeavours.

As a result, Monte felt obliged to make use of a variety of translation strategies in order to describe in a sufficiently transparent way the many fighting techniques and tricks which he wanted to convey to his readers. Fortunately enough, he did not have to break entirely new ground, as he could rely and elaborate on the work previously carried out by Ayora in the *De dignoscendis hominibus*.<sup>57</sup> To begin with, Monte decided to stick to the vernacular, mainly though not exclusively Spanish, terminology that had crystallized in his days. As he openly and utterly unapologetically announces in the introductory chapter to his treatise, especially in dealing with offensive and defensive weapons, he will simply borrow the required terms from the vernacular, adding that ,since we put their names in the vernacular, it is necessary that the Latin imitate the vernacular idiom.<sup>58</sup> This rather vague sentence may signify that Monte will ,naturalize' the vernacular terms which he has chosen by giving them the spelling and the endings of the Latin language (this he actually does, as we shall see below).<sup>59</sup> However, it can also mean that he will try to find, or even coin, purely Latin words that somehow resemble the vernacular ones which

<sup>55</sup> *Collectanea*, lib. 1, cap. 1, f. 11: *Arma defensibilia, que in brachio sinistro causa defensionis tenere solemus, sepiissime ad latinum eloquium applicari queunt.*

<sup>56</sup> Lib. 1, cap. 1, f. 10: *In vulgari vocabula firma aut tanquam firma habita de quocunque exercitio reperiuntur ab omnibus hominibus intellecta; in latino vero econverso se habet.*

<sup>57</sup> In the introductory chapter (lib. 1, cap. 1, f. 10), Monte dutifully acknowledges his debt to him: *Gundisalvus Ayora etiam in traducendo librum de cognitione pleraque exposuit, in cuius quidem expositione ipse quoque acquiescam.*

<sup>58</sup> *Collectanea*, lib. 1, cap. 1, f. 10: *Quia in vulgari nomina ponimus, oportet quod latinitas vulgare idioma imitetur.*

<sup>59</sup> This is the interpretation favoured by Fontaine, *Comment Pietro del Monte, condottiere italien, parlait espagnol* (as in n. 1), p. 167.

they are meant to replace or at least illuminate (a strategy he also appears to adopt).

When dealing with wrestling and fighting with weapons, Monte continues, he will also use rather uncommon vernacular terms.<sup>60</sup> Some of the borrowings he will explain in Latin – a practice that is very unusual in the vernacular, he notes. Those that have already been used and explained in *De dignoscendis* (notably vaulting terms) the readers are expected to understand<sup>61</sup> – a remark that confirms once more that this treatise functions as an indispensable complement to the *Collectanea*: the latter cannot be read, nor even properly understood, without consulting the former. Apart from borrowing and coining neologisms, Monte indicates that he will also resort to circumlocution or periphrasis (*circumscriptio*) in order to cater for the needs of learned men, even though this procedure will inevitably render his text more verbose and long-winded.<sup>62</sup> We have already noticed that Monte perceives Latin as a poor and unstable language. Here it is presented by him, perhaps somewhat paradoxically, as a language marked by prolixity. According to Monte, these features are intimately connected to one another. Indeed, verbosity does not only result from the need to offer men of letters additional explanation, but also from the lack of a stable, fixed terminology which forces the author / translator to adduce more than one Latin word in order to illustrate a single vernacular technical term.<sup>63</sup>

All this does not sound too unfamiliar to us: Monte's general strategy appears to be quite similar to Ayora's. However, this does not mean that Monte's actual translation practice was identical to his friend's. On the contrary, a de-

<sup>60</sup> *Collectanea*, lib. 1, cap. 1, f. 10: *Et ego inter alios ad conformitatem membrorum accipiendi ac dimittendi in vulgari quedam inusitata vocabula adinveni*. This sentence may also mean that Monte, following the lead of others, has invented (*adinveni*) new terms, not used, or at least unusual (*inusitata*), in the vernacular. This interpretation seems to be in line with Ayora's comments on Monte's Spanish discussed above.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*: *Interdum pro habenda maiori intelligentia aliqua vocabula exponemus, quod in vulgari fieri non solet, nisi quomodo bene aut male agimus. Sed presupponemus (dum nova non sint) omnes intelligere, sicuti nos in libro de cognitione hominum scripsimus, agendo de voltis seu modo tripudiandi aut girandi super equo*.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*: *Duabus de causis multo prolixius in latino scribemus quam in idiomate scriptum sit; prima siquidem quia exercitia membrorum, ubi maximum robur corporum expetitur, potius inter indoctos litterarum quam penes sequentes litteras reperiuntur, qua de causa, ut hij homines facilius intelligant, dispositiones per circumscriptionem adducende sunt*.

<sup>63</sup> See n. 55. The translational device of circumlocution was sometimes aptly called *pluribus verbis*. Cf. Renier, *Interpretatio* (as in n. 47), pp. 108–111. For a slightly different analysis of the introductory chapter which does not take into account modern research on early modern translation theory and practice, see Fontaine, *Comment Pietro del Monte, condottiere italien, parlait espagnol* (as in n. 1), pp. 167–168.

tailed comparison reveals some remarkable differences between the two translators. For one thing, Monte realized that he had to proceed in a more didactic way than Ayora had done in *De dignoscendis*. That seems to be the reason why the endlessly long description and analysis of particular fighting techniques is preceded by an *Expositio verborum*, a glossary which lists many of, though by no means all, the technical terms that will be used further on in the treatise. The words listed are followed by a brief definition in which we can discern the various translational options discussed above.

Sometimes Monte limits himself to offering a vernacular term which, as a rule, is Latinized:

*Dum tergum alterius apprehendimus aut nostrum capitur Castellano idiomate dare vel accipere spaldas dicitur.*  
(lib. 1, cap. 1, f. 11)

When we seize the other's back or ours is seized, we say, in Castilian, 'to give or receive *spaldas*'.

When needed, he indicates that a common Spanish word is used in a very specific meaning dependent on the very specific context in which it is used. This is for instance the case with the Latinized vernacular *armare* which Ayora had already discussed at length:

*Dum pedes nostri tibias alterius infestant, ut ruere ipsum faciant, armare pariter in Hispana lingua communi vocabulo habetur pro quacunque pedum industria dum palestra certatur* (f. 10).

When our feet attack the opponent's legs to make him fall, *armare* is likewise the common Spanish term for any practice of the feet in wrestling.

In other cases, Monte adds a Latin equivalent to a borrowed word:

*Prehensa seu apprehensio manuum dicitur dum manus unius cum manu alterius copulatur* (f. 11).

*Prehensa* or *apprehensio manuum* ('seizing of hands') is said when the hand of one is coupled with the hand of the other.

As this example illustrates, the proposed equivalent does not always stem from classical Latin; quite often Monte adopts a late Latin or medieval Latin word.<sup>64</sup> Not infrequently, the author resorts to doublets in order to translate a

<sup>64</sup> *Apprehensio*, in the meaning of 'a seizing upon, laying hold of', is a late Latin derivative of the verb *apprehendere*; cf. Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (as in n. 29), p. 143, s.v. *apprehensio*. The word was commonly used in the Middle Ages to denote, among other



vernacular term.<sup>65</sup> This is notably the case with the Latinized vernacular *mediana*:

*Medianam appellamus ex eo quod tibia nostra per dimidium tiliarum alterius ingreditur et unam alterius cum tibia nostra circumdamus, et sic mediana potest circumdata vel revoluta nuncupari, quam Ayora anguigeram vocabat (ibid.).*

The *mediana* we name from the fact that our leg enters between the legs of the opponent and we hook our leg around one of the opponent's legs, and thus that can be called *mediana circumdata* (encircled) or *mediana reuoluta* (revolved); Ayora calls it *anguigera*.

This passage reveals that Monte was eager to find Latin equivalents that were perhaps less elegant but certainly more transparent than the ones Ayora had coined. The brief description of the *mediana*, a trip involving wrapping (*circumdare*) one leg around one of the opponent's, makes it sufficiently clear that the neologisms *circumdata* and *revoluta* proposed by Monte are to a certain extent self-explanatory, as undoubtedly was his aim. Finally, Monte combines the use of direct borrowings with neologisms which are then explained in greater detail. The various ways of thrusting a sword is a particularly interesting case in point:

*Ut plurimum apud Hispanos, Italos atque Gallos, dum ensem exercemus, taglium, reversum et stoccatam appellamus, quod nihil aliud est nisi manu directum, manu sinistrum et obviatio sive cuspis aut puncta. Manu directum intelligitur ex eo quod ex latere nostro directo ictus provenit et in sinistrum latus hostis tendit. Manu sinistrum sive reversum est dum ex sinistra parte nostra ensem attrahimus et in partem alterius dextram tangimus. Obviatio sive cuspis aut stocchata accipitur, cum cuspidem ensis nostri adversario per directum obviando. Stocchata tamen, veluti imaginor, ortum habet a mucrone qui stocchus nominatur, quoniam stocchus modum scindendi non habet preter cuspidem ad obviandum. Quamobrem pro appropriatione stocchi stocchata appellatur et simili modo in latinitate cuspidem a cuspidem intelligere possumus (f. 11).*

As is common among the Spanish, Italian, and French, when we practice with a sword, we say *taglium*, *reversum*, and *stocchata*, which is nothing but *manu directum*, *manu sinistrum*, and *obviatio* or *cuspis* or *puncta*. *Manu directum* is understood from the fact that the blow comes from our right side and is aimed at the enemy's left side. *Manu sinistrum* or *reversum* is when we draw the sword from our left and touch the opponent at his right. An *obviatio* or *cuspis* or *stocchata* we get when meeting the adversary straight with

---

things, 'capture'. Cf. J. F. Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus* (Leiden – Boston – Köln, 2001), p. 52, s.v. *apprehensio*.

<sup>65</sup> The use of a doublet (*duplicatis verbis*) was a special case of *pluribus verbis*; cf. n. 62.

the point of our sword. *Stocchata*, however, derives, I think, from the sword which is called *stocchus*, since a *stocchus* has no way to cut apart from the point for charging. Therefore, by appropriation of *stocchus*, it is called a *stocchata*, and in the same manner we can in Latin understand *cuspis* [blow] from *cuspis* [point].

*Taglius*, *reversus* and *stoc(h)ata* are obviously borrowings from Italian, although Monte clearly suggests that they were widely used among Spanish and French soldiers as well. As in the example given above, Monte has gone to the trouble of coining self-explanatory or at least sufficiently transparent Latin equivalents. This is certainly the case with *manu directum* (a blow from right to left) and *manu sinistrum*, the latter also being called *manu reversum* (a blow from left to right). For the Latinized vernacular *stoc(h)ata*, denoting a frontal blow, Monte proposes no less than a triplet: *obviatio* (a late Latin word derived from the equally late Latin verb *obviare* with the general meaning of ‘(hostile) encounter’),<sup>66</sup> *puncta* (a rare classical word, used by Vegetius to denote ‘a prick’ or ‘a puncture’),<sup>67</sup> and *cuspis*. *Cuspis* is a perfectly classical and quite common Latin word, signifying either a point or the pointed end of a thing, or the pointed thing itself, such as a spear, javelin, or lance.<sup>68</sup> In Monte’s opinion, it is an excellent equivalent to the Latinized vernacular *stoc(h)ata*, in so far as they both have a similar origin. At least according to Monte, *stocchata* is derived from *stocchus*, itself a borrowing from Italian which signifies a thrusting sword, a kind of sword that can only be used to deal someone a frontal blow with its sharp point.<sup>69</sup> Similarly, a *cuspis* can only be used for a frontal attack as it only has a sharp point with which the opponent can be hit. On the basis of this striking analogy, Monte bluntly declares *cuspis* to be a viable Latin equivalent to *stoc(h)ata*, thereby transferring the Latin word from the realm of long-distance combat to that of close-range fighting with swords.<sup>70</sup> However odd the use of the ‘new’ word may be, homonymous with the classical *cuspis* but

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (as in n. 29), p. 1249, s.v. *obviare*; Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin* (as in n. 20), p. 273, s.v. *obviatio*; Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus* (as in n. 64), p. 734, s.v. *obviatio*.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (as in n. 29), p. 1492, s.v. *pungere* II. *puncta*; Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin* (as in n. 20), p. 334, s.v. *puncta*.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (as in n. 29), p. 504, s.v. *cuspis*.

<sup>69</sup> On *stoc(h)us*, see Malcolm Parkinson, *Weapons and Warfare* (as in n. 10), p. 449.

<sup>70</sup> The similarity with throwing a lance is made even more explicit by Monte in lib. 2, cap. 21: *Due stocchate aut puncte, una alta et alia infima, veluti cum lancea longa agimus, fortes sunt*. The transfer is in a way facilitated by the fact that *cuspis* can also signify the sharp point of a sword, as is duly indicated by the Jesuit Carolus de Aquino in his voluminous *Lexicon militare, pars 1* (Romae, 1724), p. 281, s.v. *cuspis*: *Cuspidem in gladio, hasta, clavo, et similibus dicimus extremam partem, quae deficit exitque in acumen, ac proinde a fabris pressius cuditur*. However, this does not seem to have been common usage in classical Latin.

bearing a different, narrower meaning, it eloquently illustrates the translational principle previously formulated by Monte: in coining the neologism *cuspis*, he truly makes the Latin language imitate the vernacular.

Borrowing, coining, defining and explaining technical martial terms in a glossary is one thing, using them in the actual description of particular fighting techniques is quite another. A close reading of the chapters on wrestling and vaulting reveals that Monte is not very consistent in his use of terms. He definitely shows a strong predilection for borrowings from the vernacular, and appears to be reluctant to systematically add all the Latin equivalents which he has previously listed in his *Expositio verborum*. It should be added in all fairness that he warns his readers about this in advance. He hopes that the descriptions will be sufficiently clear in themselves.<sup>71</sup> Non-specialist readers who get lost in the text can, of course, always go back to the terminological list in order to find the extra lexical support they may need. However, this is not possible when new terms are introduced, as often happens. Then readers simply have to rely on the author's explanation in the text as such. This is for instance the case in the description of various grips to be applied by wrestlers:

*Si manus cambiata habemus, veluti intelligendo dexteram cum dextera aut sinistram cum sinistra ...*

(lib. 1, cap. 4, f. 13)

If we have *manus cambiata*, by which we understand right hand with right hand or left with left ...

*Cambire* or *cambiare* is a common medieval Latin verb that signifies 'to exchange, to give or receive in exchange'.<sup>72</sup> In the context of wrestling, however, it takes on a more specific meaning which is briefly explained by Monte as it has not been included in his terminological list before. The additional information allows the reader to visualize the grip which the author has in mind, and consequently to fully understand the technique which he goes on to describe and recommend:

*... festinatim succurrendum est cum altera manu, que soluta ad brachium hostis manet. Et hoc cuique contrarietati obsistit, et ex hac apprehensione potest rumpi brachium, manus aut aliquis digitus.*

<sup>71</sup> Lib. 1, cap. 1, f. 11: *Intelligendum est quamvis non semper latina vocabula inserimus, sed, ut facilius be materie intelligantur, inquantum potero, familiariter ac dilucide inscribam, prolixius tamen quam in vulgari.*

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus* (as in n. 64), p. 117, s.v. *cambire*.

... we must come quickly to help with the other hand, which is open and remains at the enemy's arm. And this thwarts any opposition, and by this grip an arm, hand, or finger can be broken.

There are, nonetheless, instances where Monte is inclined to oblige his cultivated but non-specialist readers by repeating the Latin equivalent or equivalents previously listed. This is notably the case in his description of various tricks to be used in wrestling:

*Si hostis impetuose venit, tornus vel transversum est ponendum attrahendo ipsum ad anteriorem partem. He versutiae, ut in prologo exposuimus, ab hispanis tornus, transversum vel incontrum vocatur, et quo ad latinam proprietatem obviatio appellari potest.*

(lib. 1, cap. 3, f. 12)

If the enemy comes in a violent way, we should place a *tornus* or *transversum*, drawing him forward. And these tricks, as we have explained in the prologue, are called *tornus*, *transversum*, or *incontrum* by the Spanish, and in accordance with the nature of Latin, it can be called *obviatio*.

The passage is interesting in so far as it testifies to Monte's sloppiness in composing his text. For although *tornus* is indeed explained in the *Expositio verborum*,<sup>73</sup> this is not the case with the technical term *transversum* which occurs here for the first time and is apparently added as a more Latinate equivalent.<sup>74</sup> The word *incontrum* also features in the list, albeit as a technical term related to mounted combat: Monte proposes the word as an equivalent to the vernacular *iustra*, a confrontation between two heavily armed horsemen carrying a huge lance.<sup>75</sup> Furthermore, the example goes to prove that Monte's undoubtedly genuine efforts to create a sufficiently consistent technical vocabulary for the martial arts was not entirely successful. One and the same word occurs in var-

<sup>73</sup> Lib. 1, cap. 1, f. 10: *Tornum appellamus dum pes noster pedi alterius per partem anteriorem obviat.*

<sup>74</sup> Contrary to the borrowings *tornus* and *incontrum* which occur in medieval Latin, *transversum* is a classical word, signifying 'a cross direction or position'; cf. Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (as in n. 29), p. 1894, s.v. *transversum*.

<sup>75</sup> Lib. 1, cap. 1, f. 11: *Iustra est obviatio aut incontrum sive conflictus inter duos equestres cum toracibus grossis et scutis fortissimis, et ad obviandum grossas quoque lanceas ferunt. Iustra* undoubtedly refers to the medieval Spanish word 'justa', signifying 'combate, pelea, lucha' in general or, more particularly, 'pelea o combate singular, a caballo y con lanza'. Cf. Gago-Jover, *Vocabulario militar castellano* (as in n. 23), p. 226. *Incontrum* is a Latin word derived from the medieval Spanish 'encuentro', signifying 'choque entre dos combatientes'. Cf. Gago-Jover, *Vocabulario militar castellano* (as in n. 23), p. 161. *Conflictus* is a classical Latin word which, however, took on the meaning 'a fight, contest or battle' only in late Antiquity. Cf. Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (as in n. 29), p. 415, s.v. *conflictus*. see also Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus* (as in n. 64), p. 244, s.v. *conflictus*.

ious contexts with quite different meanings. In the context of mounted combat *obviatio* is used as a synonym for *incontrum* and *conflictus*, having the general meaning of ‚confrontation‘, whereas in wrestling it refers to the tricks one uses in confronting the opponent. In sword fighting it is used as a viable equivalent to *stocc(h)ata* and appears to have the much narrower meaning of ‚frontal blow‘. It is fair to say that such semantic shifts lead to a certain degree of terminological instability which makes the text hard to penetrate by readers. The problem is made even worse by the complete lack of illustrations.<sup>76</sup> Furthermore, Monte can be said to have disregarded the principle of uniqueness upheld by a humanist like Andreas Vesalius when he tried to reform anatomical nomenclature in his well-known *De humani corporis fabrica libri tres*, first issued in 1543.<sup>77</sup>

Vesalius’ nomenclature brings us to another important observation. A transparent description of fighting techniques does not only require a set of sufficiently fixed martial terms, but also a detailed list of precise words regarding the external anatomy of man. It seems as if Monte only came to realize this in the course of writing, or translating, his treatise. In any case, it is only after having analyzed numerous fighting techniques and discussed the complexions that characterize individual beings that he inserts such a glossary into his treatise.<sup>78</sup> As the anatomical nomenclature used by Monte has already been studied by Marie-Madeleine Fontaine,<sup>79</sup> we can limit ourselves to a few remarks. Monte begins his list by programmatically stating that he will stick as much as possible to Spanish terminology in order to ensure the lexical coherence of his work. As Fontaine has shown, however, the author uses rather few strictly Spanish terms. While he does follow the Spanish way of dividing the human body in three parts, he usually resorts to Latin in order to define its various components. Some of these Latin words appear to be classical, while others

---

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Anglo, *The Martial Arts* (as in n. 1), p. 199. Monte was acutely aware of the usefulness of illustrations, as can be inferred from *De dignoscendis hominibus*, lib. 3, *prologus*, f. 74<sup>v</sup>: *Quamquam res eadem cognitu facillima fuerat, si corporum ipsorum forma, uti circumscribitur, depicta fuisset*. He then goes on to explain why the treatise does not contain any illustrations: *Quia nondum in ipsa facultate hominem tam probe peritum invenimus, qui et mensura et habitudine opportunis cum temporis brevitate convenienti rem ipsam absolveret, id in praesentia praetermisimus*.

<sup>77</sup> On the principles underlying Vesalius’ linguistic reform, see A. Ivanova – A. Holomanova, *The Anatomic Nomenclature by Vesalius*, *Bratisl Lek Listy*, 102.3 (2001), 169–173.

<sup>78</sup> Lib. 1, cap. 76: *Descriptio exteriorum membrorum ut facilius intelligatur per membra in quibus apprehensiones agere debemus tutari aut nocere ac de causa cognoscendi complexionis*. As the *Collectanea* were published posthumously, it is very well possible that Monte was not responsible for its final composition.

<sup>79</sup> Fontaine, *Comment Pietro del Monte, condottiere italien, parlait espagnol* (as in n. 1), pp. 169–173.

are borrowings from the Greek and still others stem from medieval medical tradition. Some of the terms he uses are clearly Italian or occur in both Italian and Spanish. Interestingly enough, there are quite a few Latin terms which Fontaine was unable to locate in the dictionaries she consulted. More often than not, they seem to have been derived from Spanish or Italian.<sup>80</sup> Without further research, it is impossible to determine whether these were coined by Monte himself or had already been used in the Latin writings of late medieval and early modern Spanish and Italian physicians.<sup>81</sup> However that may be, it is quite evident that Monte's anatomical glossary is philologically no less luxuriant than his martial glossary – or his treatise as a whole, for that matter.<sup>82</sup>

### Conclusion

The originality of Monte's work is beyond dispute. As Sydney Anglo has convincingly argued, the number of 'Firsts' standing to his credit is impressive enough: „The first printed treatise on wrestling; the earliest surviving printed system of fencing; the first significant treatment in print of mounted combat; the first printed description of the art of vaulting; the earliest printed encyclopaedia of arms and armour.“ Moreover, he adds, „his writings – and the *Collectanea* in particular – constitute a remarkable fleshing out of those skeletal programmes for physical training, long familiar to students of the Renaissance from the works of fifteenth-century humanist educationalists.“<sup>83</sup> Another 'First' can now reasonably be added to the list: in writing his monumental *Collectanea*, Monte was arguably the very first author who attempted to create a transparent and coherent Latin terminology for the martial arts. While he could rely on the efforts previously made by his friend Ayora and unquestionably drew some inspiration from the latter's work as a translator of the Spanish manuscript on which *De dignoscendis hominibus* was based, Monte faced a much more formidable task when writing the *Collectanea*, as the work was con-

<sup>80</sup> E.g. *malliola* (cf. It. ‚malleolo‘); *spinella* (cf. It. ‚spinella‘ and Span. ‚espinilla‘); *costellae* (cf. It. ‚costola‘ and Span. ‚costilla‘).

<sup>81</sup> A good starting point for such a research would be J. Steudel, *Der vorvesalische Beitrag zur anatomischen Nomenklatur*, *Sudhoffs Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften*, 36 (1943), 1–42. Unfortunately, this falls outside the scope of the present article. Likewise, we cannot fill here another important gap in Fontaine's analysis by studying Monte's actual use of anatomical terminology throughout the *Collectanea*. Further research will have to confirm our impression, based on a first and limited investigation, that the linguistic instability we observed in the use of martial terms also occurs in the application of anatomical terms.

<sup>82</sup> The characterization is borrowed from Anglo, *The Man Who Taught Leonardo Darts* (as in n. 1), p. 268.

<sup>83</sup> *The Man Who Taught Leonardo Darts* (as in n. 1), p. 272.

ceived as a much more comprehensive treatise, covering basically all the fighting techniques which a soldier was required to master.

Furthermore, the work posed a greater challenge in so far as it was destined to reach a broader and more diverse readership than *De dignoscendis*, a learned Latin book that was specifically meant to be read by men of letters – and powerful patrons. The *Collectanea*, by contrast, were to be read and used by uncultivated people and educated men alike, as Monte explicitly professes in the prologue. As Marie-Madeleine Fontaine has pointed out, „Monte a eu la double ambition (...) d’obliger les *litterati* à s’intéresser en latin au domaine des exercices, et de contraindre en même temps ses soldats, malgré leur rusticité, à mieux comprendre leur propre technique par l’intermédiaire d’un apprentissage de la terminologie latine savante.“<sup>84</sup> As a result, the book had to be written in such a way that it retained the character of a practical manual, while at the same time presenting itself as the serious, learned treatment of a respectable science and art whose relevance went far beyond the confines of the training camp. In retrospect Monte’s ambition may well appear to have been a pedagogical illusion.<sup>85</sup> It is, however, quite understandable that the author cherished such an illusion. There were after all soldiers who – like Monte himself – could read, or at least speak, some Latin,<sup>86</sup> just as there were some men of letters who were genuinely interested in physical, even strictly military training.

Monte’s ambition induced him to address two quite distinctive target groups simultaneously by writing one and the same book in one and the same language – in Latin, that is. However, this single and universal *lingua franca* takes on a double, or perhaps even triple, face in the *Collectanea*: on the one hand, Monte used a Latin terminology that remained close enough to the vernacular nomenclature that had become common currency among Spanish and Italian soldiers and military trainers. On the other hand, he used a Latin that was suf-

<sup>84</sup> Comment Pietro del Monte, condottiere italien, parlait espagnol (as in n. 1), p. 167.

<sup>85</sup> Ibidem. What Peter Burke has remarked on Latin translations of early modern works on technology applies to Monte’s *Collectanea*: „The relative rarity of this type of book suggests a lack of overlap between the members of the public who were able to read Latin and those who wanted (say) to learn how to make glass.“ Quotation from *Translations into Latin in Early Modern Europe*, in Burke – R. Po-Chia Hsia, *Cultural Translation* (as in n. 42), p. 74.

<sup>86</sup> It was not uncommon for soldiers, a typically nomadic group, to use some kind of Latin as a *lingua franca*. According to Peter Burke, this was especially, though not exclusively, the case in East-Central Europe. Cf. his articles “Heu Domine, Adsunt Turcae”: A Sketch for a Social History of Post-Medieval Latin, in id., *The Art of Conversation* (Ithaca, New York, 1993), pp. 34–65 (esp. pp. 55–56) and *Latin: A Language in Search of a Community*, in id., *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe*, *The 2002 Wiles Lectures* given at Queen’s University, Belfast (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 43–60 (esp. pp. 46–47).

ficiently pure to be intelligible to, and acceptable for, learned men. This is not to say that Monte aimed to write as a humanist. Contrary to his friend and translator Ayora, he felt no qualms about using word forms that smacked of medieval Latin, although he made sure also to cater for the tastes of a more sophisticated humanist readership by regularly adding more classical equivalents. All in all, Monte's extreme flexibility in creating new words and his readiness to personally decide on the meaning of (existing or new) words, as if meaning were solely or mainly based on human convention, corresponds more with medieval linguistic practice than with the typically humanist endeavour to purify the Latin language by returning as much as possible to classical usage; the correct and refined use of pure and genuine Latin was not really Monte's concern.<sup>87</sup>

When writing his *Collectanea*, Monte was confronted with an important gap in the Latin as it was taught and used in his days: it simply lacked a sufficiently detailed and precise vocabulary to describe and analyze the martial arts. Monte made a serious attempt at filling this gap by enriching the Latin language of his days with a vast array of borrowings and neologisms. In doing so, he made a significant contribution to the development of Latin as a living tool of communication in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Admittedly, his attempt was not entirely successful. The Latin he used clearly betrays the struggle he was forced to fight in order to master and mould the language to his particular needs as a soldier-scholar. In many respects it is a weird, contorted Latin, replete with terms which are sometimes so idiosyncratic as to verge on linguistic solipsism. Anyhow, his attempt at creating a useful technical vocabulary for describing and analyzing the martial arts did not have a lasting impact on the Latin language. When, early in the eighteenth century, the Italian Jesuit Carolus de Aquino (1654–1737) compiled his all-encompassing *Lexicon militare*, the Latin martial terminology coined by Monte had long been forgotten; hardly any of his many borrowings and neologisms found their way into this vast monument of philological erudition, despite the fact that the compiler paid due attention to Latin military nomenclature from classical antiquity as well as from the middle ages and early modern times.<sup>88</sup> By

<sup>87</sup> Cf. Sharpe, *Vocabulary* (as in n. 21), pp. 93–94 and Kristian Jensen, 'The Humanist Reform of Latin and Latin Teaching', in Jill Kraye (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 63–81 (esp. pp. 68–69). It should be added, however, that far from being a typically medieval phenomenon, language mixture in general occurred on an even larger scale in early modern times. Cf. Peter Burke, *Mixing Languages*, in id., *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe* (as in n. 86), pp. 111–140.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. *Lexicon militare* (Romae, 1724), vol. 1, *Praefatio ad lectorem*, § IV: *In recensione vocabulorum, quibus arma, machinae, et universa facultas bellica continetur, non ea solum, quae veteris purgatique essent Latii, verum ea insuper, quae a mediae infimaeque Latinitatis scriptoribus sunt tradita, complexus sum.*



the early eighteenth century, Monte's achievements – linguistic and other – had fallen into almost complete oblivion; his name lived on, buried among thousands and thousands of other names, in the learned biographical dictionaries of poly-historic scholars like Christian Gottlieb Jöcher and Johann Heinrich Zedler.<sup>89</sup> In short, Monte failed. He failed to gain lasting fame as the author of a scholarly, yet practical work on the martial arts, just as he failed to have a lasting, indelible impact on the Latin language as a translator of vernacular martial terminology. But at least he made an attempt at enriching the ancients' tongue. While doing so, he struggled, and stumbled, and it is precisely this struggle, in many ways unsuccessful but heroic, that makes him so fascinating for Neo-Latin scholars today.

Toon Van Houdt – Ingrid Sperber

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

---

We have been able to trace only very few terms used by Monte: *justa* (*Lexicon*, vol. 1, p. 524 – with a spelling, explanation and etymology that do not entirely correspond with Monte's); *tripudiare* s.v. *tripudio* (*Lexicon*, vol. 2, p. 379); *aza* (*Additiones ad Lexicon militare* [Romae, 1727], p. 21). By the same token, none of the neologisms discussed in this article can be found in Index no 27 to Du Cange's *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis*, tom. 10, pp. Ckxii–ckxvi devoted to *Res militaris, seu vocabula ad eam pertinentia*. On the life and works of Carolus de Aquino, see the entrance Aquino, Carlo d' in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 4 (1961), electronically accessible through [www.treccani.it/enciclopedia](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia).

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Jöcher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon* (Leipzig, 1751), vol. 3, col. 643, s.v. *Montius* (*Petrus*); Zedlers *Grosses vollständiges Universallexicon aller Wissenschaften und Künste* (Leipzig, 1731–1754), vol. 21, col. 1376, s.v. *Montius* (*Peter*).